



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,706	05/01/2002	Stefan Kastner	VAW-6	1805
21890	7590	08/05/2004	EXAMINER	
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP			COZART, JERMIE E	
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
1585 BROADWAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299			3726	

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/019,706	KASTNER, STEFAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jermie Cozart	3726	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 6-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 6-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6-8, 11, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony et al. (3,809,155) in view of Junker (1,701,889).

Anthony discloses producing an aluminum composite material (2, 4), wherein at least one cladding sheet (4) of a specified thickness suitable for use as a cladding sheet is obtained from a first ingot made from a first aluminum material, the cladding sheet (4) is placed on a side of a second ingot (2) made from a second aluminum material, the cladding sheet (4) and second ingot are rolled wherein the rolling comprises several roll passes thereby producing the aluminum composite material. *See column 2, line 22 – column 3, line 44, and figure 1 for further clarification.*

Anthony, however, does not disclose the cladding sheet being cut from a first ingot, the cutting comprising sawing, or the cladding sheet having a thickness of 2 mm to 100 mm.

Junker discloses cutting or rather a sheet from an ingot as shown in figure 1, the cutting tool acts as a saw to cut the sheet from the ingot. *See entire document for further clarification.*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to cut the cladding sheet of Anthony by sawing the cladding from a first ingot, in light of the teachings of Junker, in order to effectively manufacture a strip of metal sheet free from surface impurities.

Regarding claims 8, 11, and 16, Anthony/Junker discloses the claimed invention except for the cladding sheet having a thickness of 2 mm to 100 mm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cladding sheet of Anthony/Junker with a thickness of 2 mm to 100 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

3. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony/Junker as applied to claims 6-8 and 14 above, and further in view of Nicholson et al. (4,957,821).

Anthony/Junker as modified above discloses all of the claimed subject matter except for prior to rolling, treating at least one surface of the cladding sheet.

Nicholson discloses treating (e.g. cleaning, pickling, grinding, etc.) at least one surface of the cladding sheet (12). See *column 2, lines 8-13, and figure 1 for further clarification*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to treat the surface of the cladding sheet of Anthony/Junker prior to rolling, in light of the teachings of Nicholson, in order to effectively clean and prepare the cladding sheet for processing.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 5-10, filed 4/22/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Anthony (3,809,155), Junker (1,701,889), and Nicholson (4,957,821) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The reference cited on the attached PTO-892 is cited to show a metal clad product.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

7. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jermie Cozart whose telephone number is 703-305-0126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 am - 6:00 pm.

9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 703-308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DAVID P. BRYANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER



JC
August 2, 2004